

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Introduction

5 This is a full and timely response to the Office action of May 22, 2007. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended and new claims 12-17 introduced. No new material has been introduced.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

10 **2. Background**

Claims 1 and 3-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kunihiro Nakagawa et al. (US 5,724,159), hereinafter Nakagawa. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa.

15

3. Claim rejections

Claim 1 has been amended so that the final set of limitations now reads “a buffer pad set between the lock and the scanning module.”

20 Please note the meaning of the term “between” in the above limitation is different from that is depicted in the reference. According to present paragraph [0020] and Fig.3, the buffer pad 44 isolates the lock 40 from the scanning module 38. Thus the intended meaning of “between” here is physically isolating the lock 40 from the scanning module 38.

25

However, referring to Fig.3 of the reference, the thread of the “holding member 15” is directly locked into the screw hole 6c of the reading module 6 (Col.9, lines 50-60). There is no buffer pad positioned between the screw hole 6c and the screw 15b.

30

Due at least to this structural difference between the reference and the instant disclosure, reconsideration of claims 1-5 is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 has also been amended so that the final set of limitations now reads “a
5 buffer pad set between the shaft seat and the shaft”. Referring to instant paragraph
[0017] and Figs.2 and 3, a shaft seat and shaft are defined as “the scanner 30
comprises a housing 32 (an upper case 32A and a lower-case 32B), a shaft seat 34
positioned between the upper case 32A and the lower case 32B, a shaft 36 set on the
shaft seat 34, a scanning module 38 set on the shaft 36 and able to move along the
10 shaft 36, a lock 40 for fixing the scanning module 38, and two buffer pads 42 and 44.
Claim 6 limitations are similar.

Nakagawa, referring to Fig.1 and Fig. 3 in Col.8, lines 56-63 says “As shown in
the figures, the image reading device of the first embodiment comprises a chassis 1, a
15 frame 2 fixed to the chassis 1, a stay 3 fixed to the frame 2 by means of fixing screws
3a (shown only in FIG. 3), a guide shaft 4 fixed to the frame 2, a rail 5 fixed to the
frame 2, and a reading unit 6 supported by the guide shaft 4 and the rail 5 such that it
is free to slide toward the front and rear of the image reading device (direction A or
B).
20

Obviously, the “frame 2” and either the guide shaft 4 or the rail 5 of Nakagawa
correspond to the instant shaft seat and shaft. Fig.1 and Fig. 3 of Nakagawa shows that
the “elastic member 14” is not located “between the shaft seat and the shaft” as is
claimed.
25

For at least this structural difference, reconsideration of claims 6-11 is
respectfully requested.


30 **4. New claims**

Please accept for consideration new claim 12 and new claims 13-17 dependent thereon. Claims 12-17 are directly supported at least by claims 6-11 as filed and no new material has been introduced. Arguments for patentability parallel those previously advanced concerning claim 6.

5

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

10 Sincerely yours,



Date: 08/03/2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

15 Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in
20 D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)